

Operator Formulation of Classical Mechanics and the Problem of Measurement

Slobodan Prvanović^{*} and Zvonko Marić[†]
Institute of Physics, P.O. Box 57, 11001 Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

The basic concepts of classical mechanics are given in the operator form. The dynamical equation for a hybrid system, consisting of quantum and classical subsystems, is introduced and analyzed in the case of an ideal nonselective measurement. The nondeterministic evolution is found to be the consequence of the superposition of two different deterministic evolutions.

Pacs numbers: 03.65.Bz

Typeset using REVTeX

^{*}*E-Mail:* prvanovic@phy.bg.ac.yu

[†]*E-Mail:* maric@shiva.phy.bg.ac.yu

The correct theory of quantum mechanical (QM) and classical mechanical (CM) systems in interaction has to differ from QM and CM in respect to determinism and related topics. That is because the dynamical equations of QM and CM can not lead to nonlinear changes of states that can happen in the processes of (quantum) measurements. Quantum and classical mechanics are deterministic theories in which pure states can evolve only into pure states, not to the mixed ones. An approach to a hybrid systems, a subsystem of which is QM system and another one classical, given in [1–3], uses for states and observables the direct product of QM and CM representatives. It was objected [2,3] that the dynamical equation used there does not save the nonnegativity of states. This property of states has to be unaltered if the theory is supposed to be physically meaningful (see page 331 of [4]). We shall modify this approach by using the operator formulation of CM. Then we shall introduce equation of motion for hybrid systems and show that it appears to be capable of describing the reduction (collapse) of states in the case of an ideal nonselective measurement saving nonnegativity.

The most important features of classical mechanics, formulated in a framework of real valued functions over phase space, are: **1.)** the algebra of variables is the commutative one, **2.)** dynamical equation is given by the Poisson bracket and **3.)** pure states are those with sharp values of position and momentum the values of which, in general, are independent. To show that this can be formulated in the operator form, we shall proceed heuristically. Let the pure states for a position, in Dirac notation, be $|q\rangle$. Similarly, for a momentum $|p\rangle$. In quantum mechanics independence of states is written by the use of the direct product. With this prescription, pure classical states become $|q\rangle \otimes |p\rangle$. So, let the space of states of classical mechanics be the direct product of two rigged Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}^q \otimes \mathcal{H}^p$ (to be precise, it would be a subset of this). In such space, one can define commutative algebra of classical observables as the algebra (over $\mathbf{R}$) of functions of the operators $\hat{q}_{cm} \equiv \hat{q} \otimes \hat{I}$ and $\hat{p}_{cm} \equiv \hat{I} \otimes \hat{p}$. States can be defined, like in standard formulation, as functions of position and momentum, which are now operators. That is, pure states are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\hat{q} - q(t)) \otimes \delta(\hat{p} - p(t)) &= \int \int \delta(q - q(t)) \delta(p - p(t)) |q\rangle \langle q| \otimes |p\rangle \langle p| dq dp = \\ &= |q(t)\rangle \langle q(t)| \otimes |p(t)\rangle \langle p(t)|, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

while (noncoherent) mixtures are $\rho(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}, t)$. These states are nonnegative and Hermitian operators normalized to $\delta^2(0)$ if: $\rho(q, p, t) \in \mathbf{R}$, $\rho(q, p, t) \geq 0$ and $\int \int \rho(q, p, t) dq dp = 1$. If one calculates the mean values by the Ansatz:

$$\langle f \rangle = \frac{\text{Tr} f(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}) \rho(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}, t)}{\text{Tr} \rho(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}, t)}, \quad (2)$$

then $\langle f \rangle$ will be equal to standardly calculated $\bar{f} = \int \int f(q, p) \rho(q, p, t) dq dp$. The dynamical equation in operator formulation is defined as:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial H(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm})}{\partial \hat{q}_{cm}} \frac{\partial \rho(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}, t)}{\partial \hat{p}_{cm}} - \frac{\partial H(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm})}{\partial \hat{p}_{cm}} \frac{\partial \rho(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}, t)}{\partial \hat{q}_{cm}}. \quad (3)$$

The standard formulation of classical mechanics appears through the kernels of the operator formulation in the basis $|q\rangle \otimes |p\rangle$. This, together with (2), can be used as the proof of equivalence of the two formulations. The prescription for transition from c-number to

operator formulation of CM consists in simple change of real numbers q and p by Hermitian operators $\hat{q} \otimes \hat{I}$ and $\hat{I} \otimes \hat{p}$.

To introduce appropriate formalism for hybrid systems, let us start with standard treatment of two QM systems. When Hamiltonian is $\hat{H}_{qm1} \otimes \hat{H}_{qm2}$, the states of these systems $\hat{\rho}_{qm1}(t) \otimes \hat{\rho}_{qm2}(t)$ evolve according to Schrödinger equation given by commutator for which it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(\hat{\rho}_{qm1}(t) \otimes \hat{\rho}_{qm2}(t))}{\partial t} &= \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\hat{H}_{qm1} \otimes \hat{H}_{qm2}, \hat{\rho}_{qm1}(t) \otimes \hat{\rho}_{qm2}(t)] = \\ &= \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\hat{H}_{qm1}, \hat{\rho}_{qm1}(t)] \otimes \hat{H}_{qm2} \hat{\rho}_{qm2}(t) + \hat{\rho}_{qm1}(t) \hat{H}_{qm1} \otimes \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\hat{H}_{qm2}, \hat{\rho}_{qm2}(t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Suppose now that the second system becomes classical. This would mean that everything related to this system in (4) have to be translated into classical counterparts. Having in mind the above formulation of CM, we propose:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(\hat{\rho}_{qm}(t) \otimes \hat{\rho}_{cm}(t))}{\partial t} &= \\ &= \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\hat{H}_{qm}, \hat{\rho}_{qm}(t)] \otimes \frac{\hat{H}_{cm} \hat{\rho}_{cm}(t) + \hat{\rho}_{cm}(t) \hat{H}_{cm}}{2} + \frac{\hat{H}_{qm} \hat{\rho}_{qm}(t) + \hat{\rho}_{qm}(t) \hat{H}_{qm}}{2} \otimes \{\hat{H}_{cm}, \hat{\rho}_{cm}(t)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

as dynamical equation. One can formally express (5) by $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\quad , \quad] \otimes (\quad , \quad) + (\quad , \quad) \otimes \{ \quad , \quad \}$, where $(\quad , \quad)$ stands for symmetrized product. The explanation is as follows. The first system remained QM so its type of evolution is left unaltered. Poisson bracket is there instead of the second commutator because CM systems evolve according to Liouville equation. It is defined as in (3), now with partial derivatives in respect to $\hat{q}_{cm} \equiv \hat{I} \otimes \hat{q} \otimes \hat{I}$ and $\hat{p}_{cm} \equiv \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{p}$. Both QM and CM states and observables appear in the operator form, i.e. hybrid system is defined in $\mathcal{H}_{qm} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{cm}^q \otimes \mathcal{H}_{cm}^p$. Without symmetrization operators on the RHS of (5), in general, would not be Hermitian for QM noncommutativity. Similar equations, in the c-number formulation of CM, one can find in [1–3], where it is antisymmetric, and in [5], where it is not.

The process of nonselective measurement can be considered within the formalism of hybrid systems. In the case of an ideal measurement, the state of the measured QM system and measuring apparatus (CM system) evolves under the action of $\hat{H}_{qm} \otimes \hat{I}_{cm} + \hat{I}_{qm} \otimes \hat{H}_{cm} + \hat{V}_{qm} \otimes \hat{V}_{cm}$, where, for instance, $\hat{V}_{qm} \equiv V_{qm}(\hat{q}_{qm}, \hat{p}_{qm}) = V_{qm}(\hat{q} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I}, \hat{p} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I})$ and $\hat{V}_{cm} \equiv V_{cm}(\hat{q}_{cm}, \hat{p}_{cm}) = V_{cm}(\hat{I} \otimes \hat{q} \otimes \hat{I}, \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{p})$. The measured observable is $\hat{V}_{qm} = \sum_i v_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I}$ and it is necessary that $[\hat{H}_{qm}, \hat{V}_{qm}] = 0$ for if the quantum system before the measurement was in one of the eigenstates of the measured observable, say $|\psi_i\rangle$, does not change the state during the measurement. Then $\hat{H}_{qm}$ can be diagonalized in the same basis: $\hat{H}_{qm} = \sum_i h_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| \otimes \hat{I} \otimes \hat{I}$. To discuss the problem of measurement, there is the need to take for the initial state of QM system the superposition of eigenstates of the measured observable. The apparatus initially is in the state with sharp values of position and momentum, i.e., the state of the composite system at t_o is $\hat{\rho}_{qm}(t_o) \otimes \hat{\rho}_{cm}(t_o) = \sum_{ij} c_i(t_o) c_j^*(t_o) |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_j| \otimes |q_o\rangle \langle q_o| \otimes |p_o\rangle \langle p_o|$. Substituting $\hat{\rho}_{qm}(t) \otimes \hat{\rho}_{cm}(t)$ and each part of

Hamiltonian in $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [\quad , \quad] \otimes (\quad , \quad) + (\quad , \quad) \otimes \{ \quad , \quad \}$, one arrives to the expression for dynamics of measurement:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(\sum_{ij} c_{ij}(t)|\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t))}{\partial t} &= \sum_{ij} c_{ij}(t) \frac{1}{i\hbar} (h_i - h_j) |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t) + \\ &+ \sum_{ij} c_{ij}(t) |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \{ \hat{H}_{cm}, \hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t) \} + \sum_{ij} c_{ij}(t) \frac{1}{i\hbar} (v_i - v_j) |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \frac{1}{2} (\hat{V}_{cm} \hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t) + \hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t) \hat{V}_{cm}) + \\ &+ \sum_{ij} c_{ij}(t) \frac{1}{2} (v_i + v_j) |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes \{ \hat{V}_{cm}, \hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The last term on the RHS of (6) shows that the evolution of apparatus depends on the eigenvalues of $\hat{V}_{qm}$ and, on the other hand, as well as other terms, does not fix particular form of this dependence. This is symbolically given by $\hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t)$. For $i = j$ it is ease to solve (6) for CM parts of states: $\hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ii}(t) = |q_i(t)\rangle\langle q_i(t)| \otimes |p_i(t)\rangle\langle p_i(t)|$, where, for instance, $|q_i(t)\rangle$ stands for $|q(v_i, q_o, p_o, t)\rangle$. When the nondiagonal, $i \neq j$, terms are considered, one can assume that CM parts of states depend on the eigenvalues of $\hat{V}_{qm}$ in the same way as when $i = j$, i.e., one can assume that a complete solution is:

$$\sum_{ij} c_{ij}(t) |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes |q_i(t)\rangle\langle q_j(t)| \otimes |p_i(t)\rangle\langle p_j(t)|. \quad (7)$$

But then partial derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{q}_{cm}}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{p}_{cm}}$ would annihilate the nondiagonal elements because they are not functions of $\hat{q}_{cm}$ and $\hat{p}_{cm}$ (they do not commute with $\hat{q}_{cm}$ and $\hat{p}_{cm}$). There would be, for instance:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{q}} |q_i(t)\rangle\langle q_j(t)| = \frac{\partial}{\partial \hat{q}} \delta(\hat{q} - q_i(t)) \delta_{i,j}, \quad (8)$$

and similarly for momentum. Consequently, for CM parts of the nondiagonal elements the RHS of (6) would vanish, while on the LHS there would not be zero. This contradiction implies that assumption is not correct: solution of (6) can not be (7). Then, one can either conclude that CM parts of nondiagonal terms do not depend on time or one can assume that their time dependence differs from the assumed one. In the first case, if one takes $\hat{\rho}_{cm}^{ij}(t)$ to be equal to initial state $|q_o\rangle\langle q_o| \otimes |p_o\rangle\langle p_o|$ for all t , then time derivative would vanish, while the RHS of (6) would not be identically equal to zero. This is the contradiction, too. Therefore, a solution of (6) will be:

$$\sum_i |c_i(t_o)|^2 |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \otimes |q_i(t)\rangle\langle q_i(t)| \otimes |p_i(t)\rangle\langle p_i(t)|. \quad (9)$$

In the second case, one should assume a solution, and find it, in the form:

$$\sum_{ij} c_{ij}(t) |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_j| \otimes |q_{ij}(t)\rangle\langle q_{ij}(t)| \otimes |p_{ij}(t)\rangle\langle p_{ij}(t)|, \quad (10)$$

where, for instance, $|q_{ij}(t)\rangle \equiv |q(\frac{1}{2}(v_i + v_j), q_o, p_o, t)\rangle$.

It could be confirmed that both (9) and (10) are mixed states ($\hat{\rho}^2 \neq \hat{\rho}$) and that (7) is pure ($\hat{\rho}^2 = \hat{\rho}$). The state (7) can not be a solution of (6), due to (8), while (9) and (10) do satisfy (6). Thus, it can be said that in either case (6) produces nondeterministic (one to many) evolution from initially pure state in (9) or (10). This is the crucial difference between equation of motion for hybrid systems and Schrödinger and Liouville dynamics that constitute it. Then, among the last two variants, one has to decide by some further analyze what would be the state of the measured system and apparatus.

The last operator, (10), is continuously related to the initial state in respect to the form, while (9) is not. But, in difference to (9), the solution (10) is meaningless for it is not nonnegative operator (there could be the events with negative probability). The correct way then to express the unavoidable transition from pure to mixed state is by changing the form of a state, (9), not by changing nonnegativity. Moreover, parts of nondiagonal terms in (10) are regular states of CM system and they are accompanied with QM ‘states’ with vanishing trace. Such ‘states’ only can be interpreted as nonexistent. Regarding this, (10) becomes equal to (9) in which nonexistence of this coherent terms is formulated in the proper manner (the diagonal part is same anyhow). The dilemma of (9) and (10) may be viewed in another way. When small QM system and big CM system interact, there is the question which one would influence the other. Either QM system would be forced to decohere, or CM one would be driven in the same way by nonexistent something as by real QM states. The second occasion has to be abandoned for it is, metaphorically speaking, less possible than impossible (negative probabilities are less than probability equal to zero which reflects some impossibility). Perhaps it would be better then to say that (9) is physical result of (6) and that (10) is physically unacceptable mathematical solution.

The state (9) is in agreement with what is usually expected to happen when the problem of measurement is considered in an abstract and ideal form: To each eigenstate of the measured observable corresponds one pointer position (and momentum). This occurs with probability $|c_i(t_o)|^2$ and takes place immediately after apparatus in $|q_o\rangle \otimes |p_o\rangle$ has started to measure $\hat{V}_{qm}$ on the system in $\sum_i c_i(t_o)|\psi_i\rangle$.

If one takes (7) equal to the initial state for $t \rightarrow t_o$ (they both share the same characteristics) and compares it with (9), then one can say that collapse is the consequence of partial derivations which appear in Poisson bracket. Necessity of Poisson bracket does not follow from the need to produce this discontinuous evolution. On the contrary, it is necessary to give one to one evolutions of CM subsystem when interaction term in Hamiltonian is absent. There is nothing else in the equation of motion which can be taken to be responsible for collapse; there are no *ad hoc* introduced projectors or stochastic interactions.

Once noticed departure from determinism in the formalism, it would be noticed in (all) other aspects as some strange feature. For example, in [6] it was found that universal privileged times in dynamics of hybrid systems appear. Here t_o is such. In contrast to opinion expressed there, we believe that this is rather nice property of the approach. Namely, for described process, and all other that can be treated in the same way, pure state can evolve to noncoherent mixture, while noncoherent mixture can not evolve into coherent mixtures - pure states, *i.e.*, such processes are irreversible. This means that for them the entropy only can rise or stay constant. Then the distinguished moments of the rise of entropy can be used for defining an arrow of time. It is interesting that nondeterministic evolution of only CM system occurred in a treatment of CM by inverse Weyl transform of the Wigner function

[7].

We have discussed the form of solution of dynamical equation for hybrid systems in the case of an ideal nonselective measurement. Without an operator formulation of classical mechanics, the argumentation would not be complete. It allowed us to consider a solution as the pure state and to show that such solution can not exist for the initial state of measured system being coherent mixture of eigenstates of measured observable. Transition of the apparatus from well defined initial state in appropriate pointer positions has been analyzed in two versions. The common change of purity in physically relevant case is followed, due to established correlation between the apparatus and the system under observation, by decoherence of quantum mechanical state. The nondeterministic character of evolution comes from the superposition of two linear dynamical equations. The reason for this lies in the fact that, contrary to Schrödinger equation which is linear in respect to both: the probabilities and the probability amplitudes, the operator form of Liouville equation is linear only in respect to the probabilities.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. V. Aleksandrov, Z. Naturforsch. **36a** (1981) 902
- [2] W. Boucher and J. Trashen, Phys. Rev. D Vol.**37** No.**4** (1988) 3522
- [3] O. V. Prezhdo and V. V. Kisil, Phys. Rev. A Vol.**56** No.**1** (1997) 162
- [4] A. Peres: Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods, (Kluwer, 1993)
- [5] A. Anderson, Phys. Rev Lett. Vol.**74** No.**5** (1995) 621
- [6] L. L. Salcedo, Phys. Rev. A Vol. **54** No. **4** (1996) 3657
- [7] J. G. Muga and R. F. Snider, Europhys. Lett., Vol.**19** No.**7** (1992) 569